

The Sequence $\alpha\omega C$ in Classical Armenian

Author(s): John A. C. Greppin

Source: *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*, 1978, 92. Bd., 1./2. H. (1978), pp. 282-293

Published by: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (GmbH & Co. KG)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.com/stable/40848572>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (GmbH & Co. KG) is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*

The Sequence *awC* in Classical Armenian

The sequence *awC* (later *ōC* [Adjarian 1971. 595]) in Classical Armenian is derived from numerous phonetic sequences. Meillet (1936) makes various comments, but does not survey the whole of the constellation; in places his suggestions have been replaced by later solutions that are more appropriate. Godel (1975. 88) treats the matter of original *awC*, adding some comments not in Meillet. However, his additions are neither thorough nor do they inspire complete confidence. Even Adjarian's survey (1971. 513) does not encompass the full panoply and is further marred by the use of some apparently rickety etymologies. Since Adjarian's etymological works (1926–) were probably the basis of much of Djahukian's study (1968. 162–163, 237), Djahukian also fails to appeal to a conservative interest, and the matter is left unclear.

The sequence *awC* appears to derive from at least six different sources. This plethora alone contributes to our limited understanding of the phonetic shifts involved. And though the quite similar sequence of *ayC* is equally diverse in its origins, the predecessors of Arm. *ayC* somehow seem clear. The reasons why Arm. *ayC* is relatively transparent while the origins of *awC* are vague depend greatly on the type of material involved. First of all, the original forms that resulted in Arm. *ayC* appear to pass logically to Arm. *ayC*; secondly, there is a good abundance of incidences of these shifts; and thirdly the etymologies involved are all rather clear. This is not the case for the development of *awC*; not only are some of the shifts often without strong parallel, they also are few in number. And, of the inventory which constitutes the data base, not all the etymologies are easily apparent. It is small wonder that confusion remains.

This paper will survey the instances of *awC* in Armenian which are inherited from Indo-European sources, and pay attention to the existence of the curious alternations of *awC* (*ōC*) with *aC* and *uC* as well, phonetic shifts that seem anomalous.

I. The most straightforward producer of Arm. *aw* is the Indo-European sequence **au*; it is a shift that is exactly paralleled by IE **ai* which gives Armenian *ay* (*ayc* 'goat', Gk. *aiγ-*, IE **aiǵ-*). The instances are as follows:

1. Arm. *jawnem* 'to present, dedicate, offer', Skt. *hávate*, Av. *zavaiti* 'invoke', OCS *zovъ* 'call', Gk. *κavχάομαι* 'to speak loud, boast'; Lith. *žauvēti* 'conjure'. Chantraine (1970) instead takes Gk. *κavχάομαι* with Arm. *xawsim* 'speak' which is, I believe, incorrect. Mayrhofer (*SEW*) takes Skt. *hávate* with Gaulish *gatu-ater* '(Druid) invoker' and Goth. *guþ* 'god'. The whole etymological spectrum is in places unclear, but the traditional relationship of Arm. *jawnem* with IE **ǵhaw-* seems appropriate.

2. Arm. *awčan* 'assistance', Lat. *auxilium* 'aid', Goth. *aukan* 'to increase', Gk. *ἄέξω* 'id'; IE **aug-*.

3. Arm. *awt* 'a place for spending the night', allied with Arm. *aganim* (< **aw-anim*) 'to spend the night', Gk. *ἄεσα νόκτα* 'spent the night', Skt. *vásati* 'stay', IE **Aw-t/es/l-¹*.

4. Arm. *awd* 'shoe' (*zawd* 'band', *zawdem* 'to tie', *yawd* 'joint, link', *yawdem* 'to tie, join'), Lith. *drusti*, *áudžiu* 'to weave'. There are varying opinions about the precise Indo-European root, but a root of **au-dh-* appears reasonable; further configurations with IE **wedh-* and **webh-* are possible but not to the point.

5. Arm. *awjik* 'collar', Gk. *αῶχήν* 'neck', IE **augh-*. Other etymological decisions have been reached, and the Aeolic form *ἀμφήν* (Theocratus 30.28) has suggested an original **angwh-*. Chantraine (1968), probably correctly, suggests that Aeolic *ἀμφήν* represents contamination from *ἀμφί* 'around' and that the sometimes cited form *αῶφήν* is doubtful. Mayrhofer (*SEW*), accepting the form *ἀμφήν* as uncontaminated, allies it with Skt. *amhú-* 'narrow'. But even were *ἀμφήν* a non-deviant form, it would not dispell the realities of Gk. *αῶχήν* which Arm. *awjik* so closely conforms to.

II. The second source of Arm. *awC* is from an earlier **aPC* where **P* can equal any labial, including *m*. This development of **aPC* > Arm. *awC* is paralleled by shifts of **aTC* to Arm. *ayC* as in Arm. *ayrem* 'to burn', IE **atr-* (Av. *ātar-*, NPer. *āðar*). The same shift is also observable in Iranian loan words where the Armenian continu-

¹) With an extension in *-l-*, Gk. *αῶλή* 'dwelling', *αῶλις* 'a place for spending the night', Toch. A *olar*, B *aulāre* 'companion, friend'. The original suffix in **-t-* (> Arm. *t*) is elsewhere unknown with the root **Aw-*, but is certainly possible, being found with other roots: *gzat* 'fleece' (*gzem* 'to card'), Arm. *arcat* 'silver', Gk. *ἄργυρος* 'id', Arm. *erkat* 'iron'.

ant of Av. *āfrīnām* 'praise' is realized as Arm. *awrhnum*²) 'bless'; similarly Per. *taft* 'heat', Arm. *tawt* 'id'. Examples of the passage of **aPC* > Arm. *awC* are as follows:

1. Arm. *nawt* 'fasting, hunger', Gk. *νήφω* (Doric *ράφω*) 'to drink no wine, be on the wagon', IE **nābh-t-*; further Greek compounds are abundant: *νήπιτης* 'sober', *νηπιτικός* 'id', etc.

2. Arm. *tawn* 'feast, festival', Gk. *δάπτω* 'to devour (of a wild beast)', Lat. *daps* '(sacrificial) feast', Gk. *δαπάνη* 'an expenditure', IE **dap-n-*.

3. Arm. *awn(-)* 'possession', as frequently in *awn-a-tēr* 'proprietor', Skt. *āpna-* 'possession', IE **apn-*. Though this etymology is phonetically clear, it is unusual since the very existence of Arm. *awn(-)* is somewhat questionable. Adjarian (1926-) was the first to propose the word's existence, positing its presence in two early texts where its status seems to have been doubted by earlier editors. Its existence in later texts was also doubted. However, should Adjarian's hypothesis be acceptable (and it is accepted by Solta 1960. 133-134), then this would be another clear example of the shift of pre-Armenian **aPC* to Arm. *awC*³).

4. Arm. *awr* 'day' (GDL *awur*), Gk. *ἡμαρ* (gen. *ἡματος*), Doric *ἄμαρ*. The Greek shows the standard heteroclitic pattern **am-r/nt-*; the Armenian genitive *awur* derives its *-u-* from the normal Armenian heteroclitic pattern which shows *r* in the nominative, *u* in the oblique cases (< **-ōr-* [Benveniste 1962. 14], or **-ur-* [Godel 1975. 95. 82]) and commonly, though not consistently, an *n* in the plural. There seems to be little doubt that Arm. *awr* truly reflects the same proto-form as the Greek since an Armenian secondary pattern also conforms to the Greek usage. Note Cypriot

²) A recent discussion of this verb, from the Iranian point of view, can be found in Szemerényi 1970, and repeated in the *Abaev Festschrift* (Szemerényi 1977: 237-240).

³) Because of the difficulty of getting one's hands on the various texts, I have been able to confirm the postulated existence of Arm. *awn(-)* in only two instances. The first instance is in John Chrysostom's *Commentary on the Pauline Epistles* (*Yovhannu Oskeberani Meknut'iwn t'ltoc'n Pōlosi* [in: *Matenagrut'iwnk' naxeanc'*, Venice 1862], p. 284). Here the editor, incorrectly it appears, amends the manuscript's *ōnoy teark'* to *bnaw teark'*, citing in a footnote "Yōrinakin greal ēr ōnoy". In the *History of the Armenians* by Agathangelos (*Patmut'iwn hayoc'*, Tbilisi 1909) an earlier *(y)awnoy(n) tērn* has been 'corrected' to *aygwoy tērn*.

a-ma-ti-a-ma-ti which closely conforms to the Armenian pattern *awr awur* 'id' (Dressler 1969. 19–22). The shift of **amr-* to Arm. *awr* is paralleled by Arm. *ayr* 'man', Gk. ἀνῆρ. Meillet (1936. 154) does not treat this noun as an *aPC* sequence but rather sees it as the type **aPu* (< **aPō*), a pattern which will be discussed next.

III. The movement of the sequence **VCu*, or perhaps **VCō*, to Arm. *awC* is seen in two words. This phonetic shift is partially paralleled by pre-Armenian **aRi*⁴) which passes to Armenian *ayR*, the best example of which is Arm. *ayl* 'but, other', Gk. ἀλλά/ἄλλος 'id', Lat. *alius*, IE **ali-*. The epenthesis of *w* is much more pervasive, occurring in environments of vowels other than *a*, and after consonants other than *R*. There are two examples, and no contradictory evidence that cannot be accounted for.

1. Arm. *artawsr* 'tear', OHG *trahan*, IE **draku-*⁵); Gk. δάκρυ, Goth. *tagr*, Lat. *lacrima*, IE **dakru-*. A problem is presented in the plural where we have *artasuk*⁶, not **artawsuk*⁶. This alternation of -*aw*/-*ø*- with -*a*/-*u*- has a parallel in the proper names *Aršawir* and *Aršaruni* (< **aršawruni* < **aršawir-uni*), a loan from Iranian, Av. *aršan-* 'man' (Adjarian 1942. 296–297, Hübschmann 1898. 27). Outside of accent, which can play no role⁶), the single distinctive factor seems to be the addition of -*u*- to the stem. However, the coincidental pattern of -*aw*/-*ø*-/-*a*/-*u*- exhibited in these two roots may be illusory since the following example would seem to be contradictory.

⁴) This shift, as Godel once pointed out (1970. 143), appears only in the environment of *a*: elsewhere after a liquid it seems to produce a *j*; note *anurj* 'dream', Gk. ὄνειρος 'id'. Later (1975. 87) Godel extended the environments for *y* epenthesis, suggesting that Arm. *mēj* 'middle', IE **medhyo-*, and *iž* 'snake' (< **ēž*), IE **eghi-* were thus affected, as well as *t'oyl* in *t'oyl tam* 'give away, permit'; *t'olum* 'let'; and *šol*, *n-šoyl* 'ray of light'. The latter choices are less appealing, but certainly possible. Another etymology (Adjarian 1926, seconded by Solta 1960. 355) would show a passage of *aT* to *ay*: *nay* 'humid', Lat. *nato* 'swim'.

⁵) A voiceless consonant disappears before **r* and **l*: Arm. *li* 'full', IE **plē-*; Arm. *erec* 'elder, priest', IE **preisku* (cf. Lat. *priscus*); Arm. *erek* 'three', IE **treyes*; Arm. *lu* 'heard, fame', IE **klu-*.

⁶) Feydit (1976. 366. 42) suggests that the alternation of *artawsr/artasuk*⁶ was based on accent: "on le (*u*) trouve au singulier devant la syllabe atone -*s*^o*r*, mais il tombe devant la syllabe tonique -*suk*⁶ (cf. *usumn/usmunk*)". Thus *artawst/artasúk*⁶; which is contradicted by *aršawtr*.

2. Arm. *mawruk* 'beard (plural only)', Skt. *śmāsru-* (< **śmāsru-* by assimilation), Alb. *mjekërr*, Lith. *smākras*, OIr. *smech*, Hitt. *zaman-gur*, IE **smekru-*; Lithuanian and Armenian point to **smokru-*. The coexistence in one stem of both *-aw-* and *-u-* contradicts the importance of the pattern shown in the two words discussed above. It would be expected that this noun would follow the paradigm of *r/u/n* (*barjr*, *-ju*, *-junk'*, *-janc'* [Godel 1975. 32–33]). In this not uncommon paradigm the *r* of the nominative disappears elsewhere, being replaced by *u*; in the plural there is frequently an additional *n*. But the paradigm of *mawruk* is essentially incomplete; in addition to the nominative plural, only the accusative plural *mawrus* and GDL plural *mawruac'* are known. The paradigm, if complete, should have essentially followed the pattern of *barjr*, a paradigm that is also paralleled by Arm. *asr* 'fleece', gen. *asu* gen. pl. *asroc'* (or *asruoc'*, by secondary process), Godel 1975. 95. We would thus expect, if the Armenian paradigm for 'beard' were complete:

nom. sng. * <i>mawr</i> (< * <i>mawrr</i> ?)	nom. pl. (*) <i>maru(n)k'</i>
gen. sng. * <i>maru</i>	gen. pl. * <i>mawra(n)c'</i>

The extant genitive *mawruac'*, with a superfluous *-u-*, corresponds to the secondary genitive plural of *asr* : *asruoc'*, in place of *asroc'*. The form we have, *mawruk*, appears to be a conflation of others, and seems to reflect some analogical remodeling within the paradigm.

For these three stems, *awrtasr*, *Aršawir* and *mawruk*, no entirely clear picture can be drawn. However, *mawruk* neither proves nor disproves the importance of the secondary *-u-* found in *artasuk'* and *Aršaruni*; it does, however, leave the situation far from clear.

IV. Closely allied to this type of *w* epenthesis is that which is found in certain roots in **-nK^w-*, where **K^w* can be any labiovelar. Meillet's assumption (1936. 37, 44), that the *w* epenthesis was governed by the *n* is not wholly convincing⁷⁾. A later interpretation by Bonfante⁸⁾ (1937. 25) which was seconded with further refinements by Pisani (1950. 188–192) stated that the epenthesis was instead related to the labial element in the labio-velar. It would appear that both are partly right since we must acknowledge that,

⁷⁾ Godel (1975. 88) calls it a "dubitative suggestion".

⁸⁾ Though obvious temporal constrictions precluded Bonfante (1937) from seeing Meillet (1936), Bonfante would have been able to consult Meillet's first edition (1903. 17) which somehow he does not refer to.

for this shift to take place, it is necessary to have both a nasal and a labio-velar. If the labio-velar alone was important, we would expect **awkn* 'eye' instead of *akn* (< IE **ok^w-*). And, if only the *n* were of interest, then *ankiwn* 'angle' should have become **awkiwn* (IE **ang-*). Noting the two examples below, it seems clear that the shift is dependent on both elements of the sequence **-nK^w-* rather than just a part of it.

1. Arm. *awj* 'snake', Lat. *anguis*, Lith. *angis*, Lett. *uódze*, OCS *qžl*, IE **ang^wh-⁹*).

2. Arm. *awcanem* 'anoint', Lat. *unguo*, Skt. *anákti*, *áñja-*, Prus. *anctan* 'butter', IE **ong^w-*.

It is necessary to note that here the sequence **VnK^w-* in **ong^w-* has passed to Arm. *awC* when the original vowel was not **a*, but rather **o*. A similar development was noted in *mawruk* (< **smokru-*) where the original vowel was **o*. Recalling that loan words from Iranian (Av. *āfrīnām*, Arm. *awrhnum*; Per. *taft*, Arm. *tawt*⁹) also show indications of *w* epenthesis, we can suppose that this phonetic shift was relatively late. It appears that all instances, no matter what the original vowel, appear as *aw*, and we may make further assumptions: the **ow* that at first resulted from the *w* epenthesis was different from the regular sequence written *ow* (and which was monophthongized as *u*). Thus *awcanem* (< **ow-*) represents a standard shift in late pre-literate Armenian, and for which there appears to be no contrary examples. Additional examples of this shift, which will include **ew* > *aw*, will be noted further on¹⁰).

3. Arm. *ankanim* 'fall' (the oft referred to spelling *anganim* is a medieval development and is not pertinent) must also be included in this discussion since it shows the sequence **-ng^w-* without the expected *w* epenthesis. However, its lack of *w* epenthesis is probably due to its original form in zero grade (**sng^w-*), a pattern that is also found also in Gk. *ἐάφθη*¹¹) 'was fastened upon, clung to'. This

⁹) The tantalizing relationship of Arm. *iž*, Gk. *ἔχis* 'snake' with this group has been noted before; for references, see Fraenkel *LEW* 15. Neither Frisk nor Mayrhofer were lured into this probable dead end. Finally, van Windeken calls our attention to Toch. B *auk* 'dragon' (1976B. 153).

¹⁰) Not a part of the sequence *awC*, but still significant since it follows the same vocalic laws, is Arm. *awel* 'broom', Gk. *ὀφέλλω* 'to sweep', IE **obhel-*.

¹¹) Gk. *ἐάφθη*, a third singular aorist passive, is found only twice, but both times in the same formula, in *Iliad* 13.543 and 14.419. Its meaning is only a conjecture, and though most handbooks compare it with Arm.

implies that an original sonant **n* remained unchanged for a long time, and developed separate vowel *an* only after the first intrusion of the Iranian substratum.

V. There are a number of instances where the sequence **-VtRo-* passed to Arm. *awR*. In all instances the etymologies are sound. The shift of **-VtRo-* to *awR* is entirely paralleled by the shift of **-VtRe-* to *ayr*, a phenomenon found in *hayr* 'father', IE **pAter*; *mayr*, IE **māter*. Examples are:

1. Arm. *hawr* 'of the father', genitive of *hayr*, IE **pAtros*.
2. Arm. *mawr* 'of the mother', genitive of *mayr*, IE **mātros*.
3. Arm. *arawr* 'plow', Gk. *ἀροτρον*, Lat. *arātrum*¹²), IE **A(e)rO-tro-*.
4. Arm. *cnawl* 'parents', Gk. *γενήτωρ*, Lat. *genitor*, Skt. *janitār*, IE **genE-tor/l-*. Again, this is an example of the late shift of **ew* to *aw*.
5. Arm. *alawri* 'mill', Gk. *ἀλετριεύω* 'to grind', *ἀλετρίς* 'female slave who grinds grain', IE **al(e)E-tro-*¹³). Again, the suspected *-ew-* resulting from the epenthesis has changed to *-aw-*.
6. Arm. *ayr* 'cave' should be mentioned since it might show contrary evidence. Pisani (1944. 161–162; 1951. 70) posits a relationship to Gk. *ἄντρον*. However, he does not explain how a proto-form of *antro-* could have *y* epenthesis; for this a predecessor in the shape of **antre-* would be necessary. This we do not have, and we cannot explain why the form is not **awr* 'cave', which it is not. Čop (1956. 135–138) has another suggestion which competes successfully, proposing a rapport with Hitt. *hariya-* 'valley', a form that could easily be reflected in Armenian as *ayr*. It is likely that Gk. *ἄντρον* has little relevance, and that a relationship with Hitt. *hariya-* is more appropriate.

ankanim and Goth. *siggan* 'sink', a grievous problem remains. It was hoped that Erbse's new edition of the scholiastic material on the *Iliad* (1969) might give more data than found in Dindorf (1875) but this did not become the case, and there appears to be no way we can make advances on Gk. *ἐάφθῃ*. We remain only with Meister's suggestion (1921. 110. 2) of contamination from *λάπτω* 'send forth, attack'.

¹²) Frisk (*GEW* I. 141) suggests reasonably that the long *-ā-* of Lat. *arātrum* is from contamination with *arāre*.

¹³) The form *ἀλέτριος*, cited by Meillet (1936. 142) without gloss is apparently a ghost word, and cannot be found in literature.

VI. Two nouns of Indo-European origin remain which have the sequence *awC*. However, it appears likely that in both instances we are not dealing with continuations of earlier phonetic sequences, but rather with suffixes which were added later.

1. Arm. *canawt* 'knowing', Gk. *γινώσκω*, Skt. *jñā-*, etc. Though Frisk (*GEW* 2. 319) suggests that this word was created on a parallel with Arm. *nawt* 'fasting' (above), it would seem unlikely since there is no sure way, in the present instance, to derive the final *-awt*. A suffixal element rather than an Indo-European continuum seems most likely. Arm. *-awt* can elsewhere be seen productively in Arm. *al-awt* 'prayer' (*alač'em* 'to pray'); in *c'ayg-awt* (*ařnem*) '(to leave out) at night' (*c'ayg* 'night'); and in *amawt* 'shame' (*amač'em* 'be ashamed')¹⁴.

2. Arm. *cnawt* 'beard', Gk. *γένυς* 'jaw', Lat. *gena*, Goth. *kinnus* 'cheek', OIr. *gin*, Skt. *hānu-* 'jaw', IE **genu-*. There is no evidence for a stemfinal **-aud* or **-adō*¹⁵ which would provide us with the necessary *-awt*, and a turn to the suffixes seems appropriate. Arm. *-awt* also appears with *clawt* 'stalk' (*cil* 'id'). An adjective can be added: *karčarawt* 'brief' (*karč* 'id'); various temporal adverbs: *arawawt* '11th hour of the day' (*arawur* 'daily'), *kamawawt* '5th hour of the night', *šalawawt* '4th hour of the night'.

The inevitable problems remain. I will deal briefly with two of them, and more quickly dismiss six more since there is very little that can be said. The term *ewt'n* is not a precise part of the sequence *aw*, but its existence (from IE **septm*) refutes the rule that **ew* and **ow*, derived by epenthesis, must result in *aw* (*arawr*, *mawruk*, *cnawl*, *alawri*). However, the alternate form *ewt'n* (*eōt'n*) which has been continued into all modern Armenian dialects as, approximately [yōtə] at the expense of *ewt'n*, would seem to be a composite of *ewt'n* and **awt'n*, the latter being the form that the rules would require from an earlier IE **septm*¹⁶. Secondly, *giwt* 'invention, finding' is joined with *gtanem* 'to find', *gitak* 'knowing', and *gēt*

¹⁴ For further discussion of this suffix, see Frisk 1936. 35, and Greppin 1975 B. 65—66.

¹⁵ Modern Greek material is not always easy to evaluate, but it does contain an apparent continuant in *-d*: *γετειάδα* 'beard'.

¹⁶ There is good reason to suspect that Arm. *ewt'n* is secondary since, following the rules for aspiration resulting from initial pre-vocalic **s-*, one would expect, at best, an aspirated form **hewt'n*, which appears nowhere (cf. Greppin 1975).

'learned person'. The root is clearly IE **wid-*, and all forms except *giwt* conform to the expected patterns; there is even an extension *giwtakan* 'inventive'. Pisani (1950. 191) calls attention to the nasal infix in Skt. *vindāti* and seems to be summoning up Meillet's interest in the replacement of a nasal by *w*. At any rate, it is impossible to consider using a verb stem for the root of this noun; it is possible that an analogical process is intruding. The term *diwt'akan* 'magical, enchanted' was frequently substituted for *giwtakan*, and *giwt* may be back formation from that source, reinforced by *diwt* 'enchanter, sorcerer'.

Six additional terms, some mentioned by others as showing *w* epenthesis, are impervious to solution. The proper name *Aurslanian*/-*Arslanian* is of clear Turkish origin (Turk. *a[r]slan* 'lion, brave man'¹⁷). The spelling without *w*, *Arslanian*, is considerably more common, and is the original form from which *Aurslanian* was derived. Armenian *yawtem/yatanem* (< **y-hatanem*, Hitt. *hattāi*-¹⁸) again is possibly not Indo-European. Arm. *gawti* 'belt' probably has no relationship with *z-gacim* 'to clothe' (in spite of Djahukian 1968. 303) since the basic meaning of *gawt-* seems to be 'twist' rather than 'clothing'. Arm. *giwt* (< *gewt*) and its alternate form *gel* 'village' cannot be Indo-European¹⁹. Both *gel* and *giwt* generate the same number of derivatives (5), but the extended base *gelj-* forms eight more²⁰, and *gel* is probably original. This word, taken with *yawtem*, *gawt* and *Aurslanian*, imply that the apparent *w* is secondary and derived. Other phantoms remain: *mawt* 'near', *matč'im* 'to gain access', *mut* 'entrance', *mtanem* (< **mutanem*) 'to enter'. Though the various roots in *-aw-*, *-a-*, *-u-*, *-ø-* are of close semantic value, there is no etymology that ties each together as a

¹⁷) The alternate form, Turk. *aslan*, appears to be a later form, and a southern Turkish rendering at that. The loss of medial *-r-* is sporadic, and can be noted elsewhere (Modern Uighur *apa* = Turk. *arpa*, etc.). For a greater review of *arslan*, cf. Radloff 1893. 1.a. 327 and Sevortjan 1974. 177. Edmond Schütz informs me that an Old Turkish loan word for 'lion' appears in Hungarian as *oroslan* (from 6th–9th century).

¹⁸) It is difficult to say whether Arm. *hatanem* is genetically related to Hitt. *hattāi-*, or derived thence by loan. Usually a loaned Hitt. *h* is reflected as *x* in Armenian: *išxan/išhas* 'prince, lord'.

¹⁹) In spite of Adjarian's suggestion (1926) that it is related to IE **woik-* (after the fashion of Lat. *villa* < **vicla* < **vicula*), there appears to be no way to get the phonetic situation properly aligned.

²⁰) A suggestion, that the phoneme *-(n)j-* in medial position in compounds might be the result of Anatolian intrusion can be found in Greppin 1980.

unit. I know of no helpful comment that can be addressed to their enigmatic presence.

To conclude: Arm. *awC* is derived consistently from an IE **au*, *aPC*, *a/oCu/ō*, *a/onK^w*²¹). The sequence **a/e/oVtRo* might well be the same as the sequence *a/oCu/ō*, and the result is the same except for the added resonant. Further, the production of *awC* very closely parallels the production of *ayC*, a point that lends support to the etymologies involved. Expected sequences of **ew* and **ow* resulting from *w* epenthesis consistently appear as *aw* with the exception of *ewt'n/ewt'n* which is problematic for reasons other than the vowel color.

Cleveland State University
Cleveland Ohio 44115 USA

John A. C. Greppin

Bibliography

- Adjarian, H. (H. Ačaryan)
1926 *Hayerēn armatakan bařaran*. Yerevan. Reprint Yerevan 1971–1978.
1942 *Hayoc' anjanunneri bařaran*. Yerevan
1971 *Liakatar k'erakanut'yun Hayoc' lezvi*, vol. 6. Yerevan.
- Benveniste, E.
1962 *Origines de la formation des noms en indo-européen*, third edition, Paris.
- Bonfante, G.
1937 "Les isoglosses gréco-arméniennes", in: *Mélanges linguistiques offerts à M. Holger Pedersen*. pp. 15–33. Copenhagen.
- Chantraine, P.
1968 *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, vol. 1, A–D. Paris.
1970 *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, vol. 2, E–K. Paris.
- Čop, B.
1956 "Beiträge zur indogermanischen Wortforschung II". in: *Die Sprache*, vol. 3, pp. 133–149.
- Dindorf, W.
1875 *Scholia in Homeri Iliadem*. Oxford.

²¹) IE **enK^w* doesn't seem to follow that same pattern as **a/onK^w*. Note *hing* 'five' < IE **penk^w*, not **(h)awk'*.

Djahukian, G. B. (G. B. Džaukjan)

1968 *Očerki po istorii dopis'mennogo perioda armjanskogo jazyka*. Yerevan.

Dressler, W.

1969 "Altarmenisch *awr awur* 'Tag für Tag'". *REArm* 6. pp. 19–22.

Erbse, H.

1969 *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem*. Berlin.

Feydit, F.

1976 "Le système de la déclinaison en arménien classique", *Bazmavep* 134: 1. pp. 78–85; 2. pp. 341–374.

Frisk, H.

1936 *Suffixales -th- im Indogermanischen*. Göteborg.

Godel, R.

1970 "Diachronic Armenian", in: *Current Trends in Linguistics*. vol. 6. pp. 139–159 (T. A. Sebeok, ed.)

1975 *An Introduction to the Study of Classical Armenian*. Wiesbaden.

Greppin, J. A. C.

1975 "Does IE **sV-* give Arm. *hV-ʔ*" *KZ* 89. pp. 46–52.

1975B *Classical Armenian Nominal Suffixes*. Wien.

1980 "The Hieroglyphic Luwian Origin of the Armenian Personal Noun Suffix *-ian*". *Patma-banasirakan handes*.

Hübschmann, H.

1897 *Armenische Grammatik*. Leipzig.

Meillet, A.

1903 *Esquisse d'une grammaire comparée de l'arménien classique*, first edition. Vienna.

1936 *Esquisse d'une grammaire comparée de l'arménien classique*, second edition. Vienna.

Meister, K.

1921 *Die homerische Kunstsprache*. Leipzig.

Pisani, V.

1944 "Armenische Studien". *KZ* 68. pp. 157–177.

1950 "Studi sulla fonetica dell'armeno". *Ricerche linguistiche* 1, pp. 165–193.

1951 "Studi sulla fonetica dell'armeno". *Ricerche linguistiche* 2. pp. 47–74.

Radloff, W. (V. V. Radlov)

1893 *Opytŭ slovarja tjurskizŭ narěčij*, vol. 1.a. Saint Petersburg.

Sevortjan, È. V.

1974 *Ètimologičeskij slovar' tjurkskiz jazykov*. Moscow.

Solta, G. R.

1960 *Die Stellung des Armenischen im Kreise der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Vienna.

van Windekens, A. J.

1976 "Encore le thème 'larme' en indo-européen". *KZ* 90. pp. 12–17.

1976B *Le tokharian confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes*, vol. I. Louvain.

Szemerényi, O.

1970 "Iranica IV". *Orbis* 19, pp. 500–519. Reprinted in *Voprosy iranskoj i obščej filologii*, pp. 231–261. Russian summary pp. 259–261. Tbilisi 1977.